REMARKS

The present amendment and remarks are in response to the Final Office Action entered in the above-identified case and mailed on February 18, 2010. Claims 1-20 are pending in the application. All of the pending claims stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,449,715 to Krivoshein (hereafter "Krivoshein") in view U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0035621 to Zintel et al. (hereafter "Zintel"). Applicant has amended claims 1-6, 9-12, 14-16, and 18-20 to more clearly distinguish the present invention over the art of record. With these changes Applicant respectfully submits that all of the pending claims are now in condition for allowance.

It is well settled that a claim is not unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) unless each and every element of the claim is taught or suggested by the prior art. As argued in Applicant's previous response, Krivoshein and Zintel do not teach or suggest every element of any of the claims pending in the present application. Specifically, Krivoshein and Zintel do not teach or suggest requesting a device description identification from a process control device, receiving the device description identification at a host device from the process control device, downloading a device description associated with the device description identification at the host system, and updating a host application with the device description as called for in claims 1-18, nor do Krivoshein and Zintel teach or suggest a computer system comprising, among other things, a communication module operable to request a device description identification associated with one of a plurality of process control devices from the process control device, a storage module operable to receive a device description identification from the process control device, a search module operable to search for a device description data base storing the device description identified by the device description identification, a download module operable to download a device description for

7

the device description database, and an updating module operable to update a process

application with data the device description as called for in claims 19-20.

In Applicant's previous response Applicant argued that various aspects of the Simple

Service Discovery protocol disclosed by Zintel do not correspond with various elements of

the claimed invention. Specifically, Applicant argued that the SSD discovery request sent to

all devices on a network does not constitute a command to a particular process control device

requesting a device description identification, the discovery response (URL) returned by a

controlled network device to a user control point in response to a discovery request does not

correspond to the device description identification called for in the claims of the present

application, and that the description document disclosed by Zintel does not correspond to a

device description as called for in the claims of the present application. In making this

argument Applicant relied on a number of characteristics of the device description

identification and the device description described in the specification. In the Final Office

Action the Examiner rejected these arguments on the grounds that the Applicant was

attempting to improperly read limitations from the specification into the claims.

In the present response Applicant has amended the claims to explicitly include these

distinguishing features of the invention. Independent claims 1, 9, 14 and 19 now include,

among other things, sending a first command from the host system to a particular one of a

plurality of process control devices to request a device description identification identifying a

device description associated with the one of a plurality of process control devices, wherein

the device description identification includes at least one of a device identifier, a

manufacturer ID, or a device revision for identifying the device description associated with

the particular one of the process control devices, and wherein the device description

comprises data and operating procedures for the one of a plurality of process control devices,

including at least one of variables, methods, commands, menus or display formats associated with one or more features of the particular one of the plurality of process control devices.

Zintel teaches a Simple Service Discovery (SSD) protocol. According to Zintel's SSD protocol, a user control point (which the Examiner equates with the host system of the present application) sends an SSD discovery request to a controlled device. The controlled device responds by sending a discovery response (URL) to the user control point. The user control point can then retrieve a description document by issuing an HTTP GET on the description URL. As argued in Applicant's previous response, the SSD discovery request is not a command to a <u>particular process control device</u> requesting a device description identification from that particular device, (as now explicitly claimed), but is rather a multicast request looking for any new controlled devices that have been added to the network. Furthermore, the discovery response URL sent from the controlled device to the user control point in response to the SSD discovery request does not correspond to a device description identification as now claimed.

According to the amended claims the device description identification includes an least one of a device identifier, a manufacturer ID, or a device revision. This information provided in the device description identification allows the host system to locate the proper device description corresponding to the particular process control device that provided the device description identification. The discovery response URL provided by controlled device in the SSD protocol of Zintel does not include a device identifier, a manufacturer ID, or a device revision. Rather, the discovery response URL is simply a universal resource locator that points to a description server located on the controlled device itself. Nothing in Zintel's disclosure indicates that the discovery response URL includes a device identifier, a manufacturer ID, or a device revision as now called for in the claims of the present application.

Finally, the amended claims of the present application further call for the device description comprising data and operating procedures for the particular one of a plurality of process control devices, including at least one of variables, methods, commands, menus or display formats associated with one or more features of the particular one of a plurality of process control devices. The description document described by Zintel does not include these claimed features of the device description. The description document disclosed by Zintel is a structured unit of data that is used by a user control point to learn the capabilities of a controlled device. (Paragraph [0080]). Zintel does not teach or suggest the description document as comprising data and operating procedures for a particular process control device, including variables, methods, commands, menus or display formats associated with one or more features of the process control device.

Since Zintel does not teach these features of the amended claims, the combined teaching of Krivoshein and Zintel does not teach or suggest every element of the claimed invention. Therefore, the amended claims are not unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) and should be allowed. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner enter the present amendment, withdraw the Final Rejection and allow the application to issue.

Dated: April 27, 2010   Respectfully submitted,

                                                  By /Jeffrey H. Canfield #38,404/
                                                  Jeffrey H. Canfield
                                                     Registration No.: 38,404
                                                  MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP
                                                  233 S. Wacker Drive, Suite 6300
                                                  Sears Tower
                                                  Chicago, Illinois 60606-6357
                                                  (312) 474-6300
                                                  Attorney for Applicant